

Serial Number 09/777,061

REMARKS

Applicants would like to extend their sincere thanks to the Examiner for conducting a telephonic interview on August 4, 2004.

Drawings

The drawings were objected to because of a missing legend. Replacement sheets for the corrected drawings with the proper legend are enclosed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 43-47, 49-52, 88-92 and 94-97 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Ho. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection below. Claims 43 and 88 have been amended to improve their form. Claims 46-50 and 91-95 have also been amended to properly reference amended claims 43 and 88. Claims 1-42 and 53-87 have been cancelled. Applicants hereby reserve their right to re-prosecute the cancelled claims in the future.

The invention is directed to a technique for an information assistance provider to collect statistical information concerning the information assistance calls that it handles. In accordance with the invention, data concerning "events" which occur during an information assistance call is collected and processed (page 3, lines 17 - 20 of the specification). After an information assistance call is received by an information assistance center, "event records" are generated to record various events that occur during the call (page 9, lines 8 - 19). For example, when the call is queued by the call center switch, a first event record is generated to record the queuing event. When the call is connected to the operator, a second event record is generated to record the connection event. If the operator conducts a search for restaurants in a particular area at the customer's request during the call, a third event record is generated to record the search event, and so forth. Each event record contains information pertaining to the respective

event, including, e.g., a code indicating the event class or type, and a call identifier representing the information assistance call in question (page 10, line 13 - page 11, line 22). The event records are collected by a computer, which analyzes the data in the records. Statistics are generated to provide information concerning the calls received at the call center. For example, a tally of the number of long-distance calls handled during a particular interval may be generated (page 19, lines 24-32; page 22, lines 25-32).

Ho discloses a system for collecting data concerning short-duration electronic transactions. Such short-duration transactions are categorized into different “service classes” including, e.g., credit card purchases, health care authorization transactions, etc. (col. 4, lines 51 - 62). Each time a transaction occurs, a transaction record is generated, which comprises a transaction identifier, a service class identifier, the start time of the transaction, and the duration of the transaction (col. 7, lines 43-45; col. 4, lines 35 - 48). The transaction records are provided to a sampler processor, which analyzes the records to generate information such as traffic intensity for each service class (col. 9, line 62 - col. 10, line 9).

However, nowhere does Ho teach or suggest a “communication including a plurality of events occurring during the communication,” as recited in the preamble of claims 43 and 88. As pointed out to the Examiner in the Interview, such claim limitations were ignored and not addressed in the Office Action. To emphasize the claim limitations in question, claims 43 and 88 have been amended to repeat in their body that “the plurality of events [represented by records occur] during the communication.”

As explained to the Examiner in the Interview, under no interpretation does Ho meet all of the limitations of claim 43 or 88. For example, if the Examiner chooses to read the claimed “communication” on the “transaction” disclosed in Ho, then Ho at best discloses only one record per communication, whereas amended claims 43 and 88 require “records representing the plurality of events occurring during the communication.” Moreover, according to this reading, there is no disclosure in Ho of events occurring

“during” the transaction, as recited in claims 43 and 88.

On the other hand, if the Examiner chooses to read the claimed “event” on the “transaction” disclosed in Ho, there is no “communication” disclosed in Ho. Clearly, the claimed “communication” is distinct from the claimed “event,” and thus both cannot be the “transaction” in Ho at the same time. The Office Action seems to suggest that the Examiner read the claimed “communication” on the “service class” disclosed in Ho. However, this reading is nonsensical, as it implies that a “transaction” occurs during a “service class.” As such, amended claims 43 and 88, together with their dependent claims (44-47, 49-52, 89-92, and 94-97), are patentable over Ho.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 48 and 93 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Ho in view of Morrison.

Morrison discloses a system for scheduling data collection sessions between a collection computer and one or more computerized branch exchanges (CBXs). Telephone call statistics are retrieved automatically from one or more CBXs in the form of database records, and reports are generated from user-created templates (col. 4, lines 6-13).

In any event, claims 48 and 93 are patentable by virtue of their dependency from amended claims 43 and 88, respectively, which are patentable for the reasons set forth above.

Serial Number 09/777,061

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, each of claims 43-52 and 88-97, as amended, is believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration of these claims is requested and allowance of the application is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully,

By



Alex L. Yip
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 34,759
212-836-7363

Date: August 9, 2004
Enclosures